



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,087	09/12/2005	Ning-Ping Chan	QNAT0001P	1993
7590	04/25/2008		EXAMINER	
Leon E Jew 24301 Southland Dr Suite 405 Hayward, CA 94545			GADDY, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,087	CHAN, NING-PING	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin E. Gaddy	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the Search Report is not considered to be an information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) requires a legible copy of: (1) each foreign patent; (2) each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; (3) for each cited pending U.S. application, the application specification including claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion, unless the cited pending U.S. application is stored in the Image File Wrapper (IFW) system; and (4) all other information, or that portion which caused it to be listed. In addition, each IDS must include a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office (see 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and (b)), and MPEP § 609.04(a), subsection I. states, "the list ... must be submitted on a separate paper." Therefore, the references cited in the Search Report have not been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of submission of any item of information or any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the IDS, including all "statement" requirements of 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Petropoulos (US 7,047,502).

Consider claim 56: Petropoulos discloses a system for providing an annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document stored in a server communicatively connected to a client via a network (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**),

the system comprising a processor configured to: receive from the client data identifying said piece of textual information (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discloses the query travels over the network**);

calibrate said identified textual information into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and forward to the client a translation of said query (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer**).

Consider claim 57: Petropoulos discloses a computer usable medium containing instructions in computer readable form for carrying out a process for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**),

said process comprising: receiving data identifying said piece of textual information (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discloses the query travels over the network**);

calibrating said piece of textual information into a query (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translating said query into a second language (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and forwarding said translated query to the user (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer**).

Consider claim 58: Petropoulos discloses a method for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses**

translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network),

 said method comprising: receiving data identifying said piece of textual information (see **Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discloses the query travels over the network);**
 calibrating said piece of textual information into a query (see **Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules);**
 translating said query into a second language (see **Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page);**
 and forwarding said translated query to the user (see **Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer).**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, 20-22, 25-27, 30, 32, 35-37, 39-45, 47-52, 54-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos (US 7,047,502) in view of King (US 6,934,848).

Consider claim 1: Petropoulos discloses a system for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**),

the system comprising a processor which is configured to:

capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and display a visual cue on the user's screen, said visual cue containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claim 8: Petropoulos discloses a computer usable medium containing instructions in computer readable form for carrying out a process for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**),

said process comprising the steps of: capturing a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**),

calibrating said segment of text into a query (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translating said query into a second language (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and displaying a callout on the user's screen, said callout containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claim 15: Petropoulos discloses a method for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**),

comprising the steps of: capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrating said segment of text into a query according to one or more rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translating said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and displaying an annotation callout on the user's screen, said annotation callout containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claim 22: Petropoulos discloses a system for returning to a remote user from a web server a bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in a website supported by the web server(**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**),

said system comprising an application which operates to:

capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and display a visual cue on the user's screen, said visual cue containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claim 32: Petropoulos discloses a method for returning to a remote user from a web server a bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in a website supported by the web server (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**), comprising the steps of:

capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and display a callout on the user's screen, said callout containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claim 42: Petropoulos discloses a system for providing real-time multilingual annotation service over a global network from a server to a user (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**), said system comprising:

(a) a client application which runs on the user' computer, said client application being operable to: capture a segment of text in a first language, said segment of text being adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query; send said query to the server; and display an annotation callout which contains said query and the translation of said query returned from the server (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

and (b) a server application which runs on the server, said server application being operable to: translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and return the translation of said query to the client application (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claim 49: Petropoulos discloses a method for providing real-time multilingual annotation service over a global network from a server to a user (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**), said method comprising:

capturing a segment of text in a first language, said segment of text being adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrating said screen-scraped segment of text into a query (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

sending said query to the server (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discloses the query travels over the network**);

translating said query at the server into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

returning the translation of said query to the user's computer (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer**);

and displaying an annotation callout which contains said query, the translation of said query, and/or other reading aid information, returned from the server (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Consider claims 2, 9 and 16, 25, 35, 43, 50: Petropoulos discloses said segment of text is fixed in length (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses the defined area can be a desired size**).

Consider claims 3, 10, and 17, 26, 36, 44, 51: Petropoulos discloses the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas**).

Consider claims 4, 11, and 18, 27, 37, 45, 52: Petropoulos discloses visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

Consider claims 6, 13, and 20, 29, 39, 47, 54: Petropoulos discloses visual cue is fixed in size (**see Col. 7, lines 20-35, where Petropoulos discusses the fixed preview window**).

Consider claims 7, 14, and 21, 30, 40, 48, 55: Petropoulos discloses visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (**see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable**).

Consider claim 29: Petropoulos discloses visual cue is fixed in size (**see Col. 7, lines 20-35, where Petropoulos discusses the fixed preview window**).

Consider claim 41: Petropoulos discloses a graphical user interface further comprises: means for setting parameters of said visual cue (**see Col. 7, lines 25-35, where Petropoulos discusses controllable functional attributes**).

1. Claims 5, 12, 19, 28, 29, 38, 46, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos (US 7,047,502) in view of King (US 6,934,848) as applied to claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 32, 42, and 49 above, and further in view of Carr (US 5,428,733).

Consider claims 5, 12, 19, 28, 38, 46, 53: Petropoulos discloses visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (**see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (**see Col. 1, lines 30-40**).

2. Claims 23, 24, 31, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos (US 7,047,502) in view of King (US 6,934,848) as applied to claims 22 and 32 above, and further in view of Litster (US 7,113,904).

Consider claims 23 and 33: Petropoulos discloses a graphical user interface embedded in each page of said web site (**see Col. 3, lines 32-51, where Petropoulos discusses elements of a GUI in a web site**),

said graphical user interface comprising: means for activation or deactivation of said application (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses mouse-over activation**);

and means for selecting said second language from a list of languages.

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose selecting a language from a list, however Litster discloses selecting a language from a list (**see Col. 5, lines 55-67, where Litster discusses a drop-down list of available languages**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use selecting a language from a list as taught by Litster, thus providing dynamic multiple language support, as discussed by Litster (**see Col. 3, lines 1-14**).

Consider claims 24 and 34: Petropoulos, King, and Litster disclose application is automatically activated when said second language is selected (**see, e.g., Figure 1-3**).

Consider claim 31: Petropoulos discloses a graphical user interface further comprises: means for setting parameters of said visual cue (**see Col. 7, lines 25-35, where Petropoulos discusses controllable functional attributes**).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E. Gaddy whose telephone number is (571) 270-5134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9am - 4pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin E. Gaddy

/Benjamin E Gaddy/

Examiner, Art Unit 2626

4/11/08

/Patrick N. Edouard/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626